

**Amendment of the text of annotation °608 that refers to artificially propagated specimens of *Gymnocalycium mihanovichii* (cultivars) forms lacking chlorophyll, to read as follows:**

**Cactaceae spp. colour mutants lacking chlorophyll, grafted on the following grafting stocks: *Harrisia* “Jusbertii”, *Hylocereus trigonus* or *Hylocereus undatus***

**Proponent: Switzerland.**

**Summary:** See the general introduction to proposals 12.43, 12.44 and 12.45. Among the most widely available cacti in cultivation are colour mutants, lacking chlorophyll, of a small number of taxa, most notably *Gymnocalycium stenopleurum* (= *G. mihanovichii* = *G. m. var. friedrichii* = *G. friedrichii*), *G. denudatum*, *G. “Pentacanthum”* and *Echinopsis chamaecereus* (= *Chamaecereus silvestrii*). Because they lack chlorophyll, these plants cannot survive on their own rootstocks and are invariably grafted onto other cacti, most commonly *Harrisia* “Jusbertii”, *Hylocereus trigonus* or *H. undatus*, but also other forms including *Pereskia spathulata*. The resulting specimens are distinctive and immediately recognisable, comprising a brightly-coloured, generally pink, yellow or bright red topknot on a green stem. These forms are generally mass-produced in specialist nurseries with the most important exporting countries being Brazil, Japan and the Republic of Korea. As well as forms without chlorophyll, at least some of these nurseries also mass-produce other grafted cacti, such as *Parodia* (= *Eriocactus*) *leninghausii*, *P. (=Notocactus) scopa*, *Rebutia canigueralii* (= *Sulcorebutia rauschii*) and cristate *Cereus*. Under existing annotation °608 artificially propagated forms of *Gymnocalycium mihanovichii* lacking chlorophyll and grafted onto three specified cactus taxa are exempt from the provisions of the Convention. The proposal seeks to extend this exemption to all artificially-propagated forms of cactus lacking chlorophyll grafted onto the same three specified taxa. The supporting statement notes that the forms currently treated as *Gymnocalycium mihanovichii* are in fact *G. stenopleurum*, so that the current annotation is inappropriate. The proposal will not exempt grafted forms that have chlorophyll, nor any forms with or without chlorophyll that are grafted onto other rootstocks.

**Analysis** Cacti lacking chlorophyll cannot survive on their roots and therefore cannot exist as wild populations. Of the three taxa allowed as rootstocks, two are of horticultural origin and the third is extremely widely cultivated and undoubtedly not collected in the wild for this purpose. Adoption of the proposal will not therefore have any impact on wild populations of cacti. These forms are easily distinguishable from any cacti that might have been collected from the wild. It may not always be completely clear whether a particular grafted form lacks chlorophyll or not.

Supporting Statement (SS)	Additional information
<b><u>Taxonomy</u></b>	
<p>Most mass-produced grafted cacti that lack chlorophyll are forms of <i>Gymnocalycium stenopleurum</i>, <i>G. denudatum</i>, <i>G. “Pentacanthum”</i>, <i>Echinopsis chamaecereus</i>) and <i>Parodia scopa</i>.</p> <p><i>Gymnocalycium stenopleurum</i> is the valid name for <i>G. mihanovichii</i> var. <i>friedrichii</i>. Most of the colour forms lacking chlorophyll that are traded under the name <i>Gymnocalycium mihanovichii</i> are in fact of this species.</p>	<p><i>Echinopsis chamaecereus</i> is commonly known as <i>Chamaecereus silvestrii</i>.</p> <p><i>Parodia scopa</i> is commonly known as <i>Notocactus scopa</i>; most forms of this in cultivation, including those that are mass-produced on grafts, appear to have chlorophyll.</p>
<b>Retention in Appendix II to improve control of other listed species</b>	
<b><u>Specimens resemble other species and are difficult to distinguish, or most of taxon is already listed</u></b>	
<p>Plants in question do not resemble any cacti that might occur or be collected from the wild.</p>	<p><i>With some grafted forms it may not be immediately apparent whether the grafted plant actually contains chlorophyll or not so that it may be possible to confuse plants that qualify for the exemption with those that do not. However, all such plants are artificially propagated so that there will be no impact on wild populations.</i></p>

<b>Supporting Statement (SS)</b>	<b>Additional information</b>
----------------------------------	-------------------------------

**Other information**

**Other comments**

*One grower of *Gymnocalycium mihanovichii* cultivars has reportedly stated that he has been required to obtain CITES documentation because the colour forms had been grafted onto a cactus that was not one of the three exempted stocks in annotation °608 (Petitdemange, 2002). One of the most commonly used cacti other than the three specified in annotation °608 is *Pereskia spathulata*. This species is included in both proposals 12.44 and 12.45. If either of these is accepted, this species will become exempt from the provisions of the Convention. However, strict interpretation of annotation °608, in its original form or that proposed here, will mean that CITES documentation will still be required because the colour forms do not meet the requirements of the annotation (i.e. they will not be grafted onto either *Harrisia ‘Jusbertii’*, *Hylocereus trigonus* or *Hylocereus undatus*), even though the stock itself will not require documentation.*

*Sajeva (2002) supports the proposal.*

**Reviewers:** M. Sajeva, TRAFFIC North America.